



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/163,993	09/29/1998	MOHAN ANANDA	04500.913	6131

22804 7590 01/12/2005
THE HECKER LAW GROUP
1925 CENTURY PARK EAST
SUITE 2300
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

ABDI, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/163,993

Applicant(s)

ANANDA, MOHAN

Examiner

Kambiz Abdi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 239-272 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 239-272 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6-25-02, 5-31-02, 3-29-02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

1. The prior office actions are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the observations with respect to claim language, and response to previously presented arguments.

- Claims 239, 240, 241, 244, 246, 247, 256, 257, 258, 261, 263, 264, have been amended.
- Claims 1-238 are canceled.
- Claims 239-272 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 30 September 2004 have been fully considered. Examiner has reviewed the arguments carefully and considered the merits of the arguments against the previously presented claims in relation to the last office action as well as considering the amended claims as currently pending in the file against the new grounds of rejection and has found not basis to over come the rejections. Therefor, the arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection and the arguments are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 239 and 256 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,005,945 to Harry T. Withehouse.

Art Unit: 3621

5. As per claims 239 and 256, Withehouse clearly teaches an online processing method and system for processing postage indicia requests comprising:

- one or more client systems configured to interface with one or more users, said one or more client systems configured to send a postage request and to print postage indicia (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, and column 7, lines 54-68);
- a server system in communication with said one or more client systems, said server system in communication with one or more postal service systems, wherein said server system is configured to receive said postage request from said one or more client systems and to send postage indicia data to said one or more client systems (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, and column 7, lines 54-68);and
- administrator system software executing on one or, more computers, administrator system software in communication with said server system, said administrator system software comprising a statistical analysis report module configured to provide one or more reports about user transactions (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, column 7, lines 54-68, column 11, lines 60-68, and column 15, lines 60-68).

6. As per claims 246 and 263, Whitehouse clearly teaches an online processing method and system for processing postage indicia requests comprising:

- one or more client systems configured to interface with one or more users, said one or more client systems configured to send a postage request and to print postage indicia (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, and column 7, lines 54-68);
- a server system in communication with said one or more client systems, said server system in communication with one or more postal service systems, wherein said server system is configured to receive said postage request from said one or more client systems and to send

Art Unit: 3621

postage indicia data to said one or more client systems (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, and column 7, lines 54-68);

wherein said server system comprises:

- a database comprising stored account information of said one or more users (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, and column 7, lines 54-68);
- a user account interface module configured to respond to an account request received from a given client system by retrieving a portion of said stored account information that is associated with a respective user of said given client system and providing said portion to said given client system (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, and column 7, lines 54-68).

7. Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3621

9. Claims 240-245, 247-255, 256-262, and 265-272 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,005,945 to Harry T. Withehouse in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,752,950 to Marc Le Carpenter.

10. As per claims 247 and 264, Withehouse clearly teaches an online processing method and system for processing postage indicia requests.

- one or more client systems configured to interface-with one or more users, said one or more client systems configured to send a postage request and to print postage indicia (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, column 7, lines 54-68, column 11, lines 60-68, and column 15, lines 60-68);
- a server system in communication with said one or more client systems, wherein said server system is configured to receive said postage request from said one or more client systems and to send postage indicia data to said one or more client systems; wherein said server system comprises (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, column 7, lines 54-68, column 11, lines 60-68, and column 15, lines 60-68):
- a postal service interface module for interfacing with one or more postal service systems (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, column 7, lines 54-68, column 11, lines 60-68, and column 15, lines 60-68);

What Whitehouse is not clear and specific is,

- a statistical reports module interfacing with said postal service interface module, said statistical reports module configured to provide reports associated with usage of said on-line postage system by said one or more users.

11. However, Le Carpenter clearly teaches the above-mentioned limitation (See Le Carpenter abstract, figures 1-3 and associated text and column 2, lines, 16-66 column 3, lines 41-64 and column 6, lines 1-68 and column 9, lines 27-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to add an statistical analysis module to the existing

Art Unit: 3621

system to provide better accounting and forecasting of needed marketing or budgeting as well as tracing fraudulent use of postage indicia.

12. As per claims 240-245 and 257-262, Whitehouse teaches all the limitations of claims 239 and 256, further; Whitehouse teaches,

- a user financial information module configured to facilitate reviewing and monitoring the financial status of said one or more users (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, column 7, lines 54-68, column 11, lines 60-68, and column 15, lines 60-68);
- a license database access module configured to facilitate access to said license database and review of, for each of said one or more users, the status of a license issued by a postal service authority (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, column 7, lines 54-68, column 11, lines 60-68, and column 15, lines 60-68);
- a system access security module configured to secure communication between said server system and said administrator system software (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 3, lines 50-55, column 6, lines 9-18, column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, column 7, lines 54-68, column 11, lines 60-68, and column 15, lines 60-68).
- said client and administrator system and said server system each comprises an internet access module configured to facilitate communication between said client and administrator system and said server system over the internet (See Whitehouse column 7, lines 54-67, and column 8, lines 23-29).

13. What Whitehouse is not clear and specific is the use of a flat file access module configured to facilitate review of information in said, flat files, in order to transmit data back and forth. However, it is clear in Whithouse's teaching that data needs to be stored as well as communicated and to use any kind of file to store or communicate data would have been obvious. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 3621

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to use the flat file format of data files for the purposes of better data integrity as well as size and ease of use also to keep from repetition of any data elements more than once in each data file.

14. As per claims 248-255 and 265-272, Whitehouse teaches all the limitations of claims 247 and 264, further, Whitehouse teaches,

- a data update interface module interfacing with said postal service interface module, said data update interface module facilitating updating of postage rate information on said server system by said one or more postal service systems (See Whitehouse column 3, lines 56-65, column 31, lines 19-42).
- a utility module interfacing with said postal service interface module, said utility module providing an interface with an archiving module (See Whitehouse column 11, lines 30-57).
- wherein said server system further comprises a financial interfaces module configured to facilitate a transaction between said server system and a financial system having a postal service account, said transaction comprising information associated with a transfer of funds from a user account to said postal service account (See Whitehouse column 13, line 66-column 14, line 46).
- wherein said server system further comprises a server access security module configured to manage and restrict access to said server system (See Whitehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and abstract, column 7, line 54-column 8, lines 3, column 10, line 45-column 11, lines 36).
- a data update interface module interfacing with said postal service interface module, said data update interface module facilitating updating of zip code information on said server system by said one or more postal service systems (See Whitehouse column 3, lines 56-65, column 31, lines 19-42).
- a utility module interfacing with said postal service interface module, said utility module providing an interface with a report generating module configured to provide reports of

Art Unit: 3621

transactions in said on-line postage system (See Withehouse abstract, figures 4, 5A-5B and column 6, line 20-column 7, lines 12, column 7, lines 54-68, column 11, lines 60-68, and column 15, lines 60-68).

15. What Whitehouse is not clear and specific is the use of a flat file access module configured to facilitate review of information in said, flat files, in order to transmit data back and forth. However, it is clear in Whithouse's teaching that data needs to be stored as well as communicated and to use any kind of file to store or communicate data would have been obvious. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to use the flat file format of data files for the purposes of better data integrity as well as size and ease of use also to keep from repetition of any data elements more than once in each data file.

16. What Whithouse is not clear and specific is a utility module interfacing with said postal service interface module, said utility module providing an interface with a user activity-monitoring module. However, Le Carpenter clearly teaches a user activity monitoring subsystem (See Le Carpenter abstract, figures 1-3 and associated text and column 2, lines, 16-66 column 3, lines 41-64 and column 6, lines 1-68 and column 9, lines 27-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to add an monitoring module to the existing system to provide better accounting and forecasting of needed maintenance or budgeting as well as more security and control over the remote system.

17. Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response,

Art Unit: 3621

to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kambiz Abdi whose telephone number is (703) 305-3364. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

20. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231**

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

(703) 746-7749 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

**Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive
7th floor receptionist, Arlington, VA, 22202**

**Kambiz Abdi
Examiner**

January 10, 2005

**JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**